

Amendment dated: February 4, 2004

Application Serial No.: 09/661,375

Attorney Docket No. 23453-020

In Response to Final Office Action mailed September 5, 2003

**REMARKS**

In response to the Final Office Action mailed September 5, 2003 (Paper No. 9), claims 1-8, 19-20, and 22-26 have been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer, and claims 27-28 have been newly added. Therefore, claims 27-28 are pending. Support for newly added claims 27-28 is provided throughout the as-filed Specification. Thus, no new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and following comments, allowance of all the claims pending in the application is respectfully requested.

***Non-Statutory Double Patenting Rejection***

Claims 1 and 19 stand rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as allegedly being unpatentable over claims 1, 6, 8-14, 31, 33, and 36-42 of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,051 to Saylor et al. (“Saylor”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,269,336 to Ladd *et al.* (“Ladd”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,389,398 to Lustgarten *et al.* (“Lustgarten”). *See* Final Office Action, pg. 4, ¶’s 5-6. Applicants submit that the cancellation of claims 1 and 19 (without prejudice or disclaimer) renders this rejection moot.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103***

Claims 1-8, 19, 20, and 22-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Ladd in view of Lustgarten. *See* Final Office Action, pg. 2, ¶4. Applicants submit that the cancellation of claims 1-8, 19, 20, & 22-26 (without prejudice or disclaimer) renders this rejection moot.

Newly added claims 27-28 each recite the features of generating content for at least one voice service when the voice service is executed, and applying subscriber-specific personalization information (for each subscriber of voice service) to the generated content, so that the generated content can be personalized for each subscriber. Moreover, claims 27-28 also

Amendment dated: February 4, 2004

Application Serial No.: 09/661,375

Attorney Docket No. 23453-020

In Response to Final Office Action mailed September 5, 2003

recite that personalized content for a subscriber is formatted into a unique active voice page generated for the subscriber. Neither Ladd, Lustgarten, nor the other references of record appear to disclose, teach, or suggest at least these features.

### CONCLUSION

Having addressed each of the foregoing rejections, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 4, 2004

By:



\_\_\_\_\_  
Bradford C. Blaise  
Registration No. 47,429

MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY, AND POPEO, PC  
12010 Sunset Hills Road  
Suite 900  
Reston, Virginia 20190  
(703) 464-4800 (Telephone)  
(703) 464-4895 (Facsimile)

RES 106113v1